



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/684,205	10/06/2000	Jack H. Hetherington	PIE-10102/29	2529
75	590 07/02/2003			
Gifford Krass Groh Sprinkle Patmore Anderson &			EXAMINER NGUYEN, JIMMY H	
Citkowski Attn John Posa 280 N Old Woodward Ave Suite 400 Birmingham, MI 48009				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Dirimignam, iv	11 10007		2673	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/684,205	HETHERINGTON, JACK H.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jimmy H. Nguyen	2673
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 2. ☐ The proposed amondment(s) will not be entered by	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further	·	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	,	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · ——	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: None.		
Claim(s) objected to: None.		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-12 and 14-26.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.		
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:		·





"Continuation of 2. NOTE: At least the newly amended claim 8 raises new issue that would require a further consideration and/or search. Further, regarding to the drawing objection under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5), since figure 1B does not include the reference sign of each arrow pointer, this objection is therefore maintained. Regarding to the drawing objection under 37 CFR 1.83(a), the drawings must show the claimed feature, "an entire radial area around the axis of rotation" of claim 25, this objection is therefore maintained. Regarding to the rejection under 35 USC 112, to claims 8 and 9, the newly amended claim 8 overcomes this rejection, however, the scope of the claimed invention is changed, a further consideration and/or search is further required. Regarding to the rejection under 35 USC 112 to claims 25 and 26, since the claimed feature, "entire raidial area around the axis of rotation" is not illustrated by drawings or described implicitly in the disclosure, examiner does not understand what applicant means "neither plate consuming an entire radial area around the axis of rotation of claim 25. Furthermore, applicant argument filed "It would be apparent to anyone of skill in the art that neither plates 802 nor 804 occup. an entire radial area around the axis of rotation" is not persuasive, because the claimed feature must be implicitly or inherently teach in the disclosure, but must not be simply recognized by anyone skilled in the art (see MPEP 2163.07(a)). Regarding to the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) to claims 25 and 26, since examiner did not request to add the word, "stationary", to these claims, applicant's argument is no directed to the rejection to these claims in the last office action, this rejection is therefore maintained. Regarding to the rejection under 35 USC 103 to claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-12 and 14-26, applicant's argument filed "there is no motivation to combine these references" is not persuasive, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, since the signal detecting capacitor plate is stationary, the wide voltage fluctuations and variations in the signals to be sensed between the signal detecting capacitor plate and the electronic circuit, due to the movement of the signal detecting capacitor plate, are prevented so that the position of the joystick handle is measured accurately. Furthermore, applicant's argument filed that the combination of Shahoian and Baker does not teach a member laterally shift the dielectric element in a plane substantially parallel to the stationary plates as a function of user position, is not persuasive because Shahonian implicitly teaches a member (112) operative to laterally shift the dielectric member (15) in a plane substantially parallel to the signal detecting capacitor plate (14) and the stationary signal transmitting plate (12) (col. 4, lines 43-52, col. 9, lines 51-54). and Baker teaches a member (107) operative to laterally shift the dielectric member (143) in a plane substantially parallel to the stationary plates (plates 135) as a function of user (fig. 1). Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC 103 is maintained.

> BIPIN SHALWALA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600